

REMARKS

The above-identified application is United States application serial number 09/845,390 filed on April 30, 2001. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 are rejected. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,445,460 Pavley in view of USPN 6,177,956 Anderson et al.

Specification

Applicant has amended the Title to clearly indicate the invention to which the claims are directed.

Drawings

Applicant has attached drawings to include the –Prior Art—legend in Figure 1 as directed by the Examiner. Figure 1 is also amended to include a description of each block as described in the specification so that no new matter is added. Amendments to Figure 1 increase the figure size so that Figures 1 and 2 are separated onto different sheets. A full set of replacement drawings are submitted.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of all claims.

The rejection of claim 1 is traversed on the grounds that Pavley in view of Anderson fail to disclose “storing image data elements consecutively in an image storage queue.” The Examiner admits that “Pavley does not teach consecutively storing the image data in an image storage queue.” Anderson et al however also does not teach the claimed usage of the image storage queue, but rather discloses “input queues 78” which are not used to store image data, instead storing “data cell pointers” which are used to move data to and from data cells that are used to hold captured image data. Accordingly, Anderson does not teach usage of a queue to store and handle images, but rather uses an input queue to hold pointers to image data.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 3 on the basis that Pavley in view of Anderson do not disclose “naming said filename to indicate said archival status.”

Pavley discloses "file attribute designations" as part of an image file and that one of the attributes may be an "archival file attribute", but says nothing about usage of a filename that specifies archival status.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 4 on the basis that Pavley in view of Anderson do not disclose "a reserved location for archived image data elements." Pavley discloses "file attribute designations" as part of an image file and that one of the attributes may be an "archival file attribute", but says nothing about usage of a reserved location for archived image data elements.

The rejection of claim 8 is traversed on the grounds that Pavley in view of Anderson fail to disclose "altering said filename by at least one character." Pavley discloses "file attribute designations" as part of an image file and that one of the attributes may be an "archival file attribute", but says nothing about usage of a filename that specifies archival status.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 11 on the basis that Pavley in view of Anderson disclose neither "connecting the removable storage medium to the external information handling system" nor "copying said image data element from the removable storage medium to the external information handling system." Pavley discloses inclusion of "removable memory" but does not mention connection of the removable memory to another device.

The rejection of claim 14 is traversed on the grounds that Pavley in view of Anderson fail to disclose either "determining that no said image data element in said image storage queue has been archived" or "notifying a user that the memory storage unit is full." Pavley only discloses "deleting image files from memory that have an archive file attribute."

Regarding the rejection of claims 2, 5-10, 12-13, and 15, applicant traverses the rejections at least on the basis that the claims depend from allowable claim 1.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 16-17 on the basis that Pavley in view of Anderson do not disclose "image data elements each having an archival status . . . stored in said memory storage unit chronologically in an image storage queue." The rejection of claims 18-20 are traversed on the grounds that Pavley in view of Anderson fail to disclose "instructions for storing image data elements consecutively in an image storage

queue, each image data element having an archival status.” The Examiner admits that “Pavley does not teach consecutively storing the image data in an image storage queue.” Anderson et al however also does not teach the claimed usage of the image storage queue, but rather discloses “input queues 78” which are not used to store image data, instead storing “data cell pointers” which are used to move data to and from data cells that are used to hold captured image data.

CONCLUSION

The application, including all remaining Claims 1-20, is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at (949) 251-0250.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as Express Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:



(Signature)

Ken J. Koestner
(Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate)



December 3, 2004
(Date)

EO 906 257 260 US
(Express Mail Label No.)

Respectfully submitted,



Ken J. Koestner
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 33,004






FIG. 3